

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                      | FILING DATE             | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/494,837                           | 01/31/2000              | Boney Mathew         | 0153.00084              | 4020             |  |
| 7                                    | 7590 12/04/2002         |                      |                         |                  |  |
| Amy E. Rinaldo                       |                         |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |  |
|                                      | iates<br>estern Highway |                      | AFTERGU                 | AFTERGUT, JEFF H |  |
| Suite 410 Farmington Hills, MI 48334 |                         |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |  |
| 8                                    | ,                       |                      | 1733                    | 93               |  |
|                                      |                         |                      | DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| <i>Ē</i>   |   | 47-2   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| · •  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action  | 09/494,837  | MATHEW ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |
| •  | Examiner  | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Jeff H. Aftergut  | 1733   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 21 November 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | oid abandonment of this application) a timely filed amendment whic  | ation. A proper reply to a<br>h places the application in                                |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>a)</li></ul>  | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin  | g date of the final rejection.   |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | of extension and the corresponding amount<br>the shortened statutory period for reply<br>ce later than three months after the mai | ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) ☑ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c) Ithey are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>22-26</u> .  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1, 8, 9, 14, 18-21.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |   | Jeff H. Aftergut<br>Primary Examiner<br>Art Unit: 1733                                   |  |  |  |  |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 09/494,837



Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment recites that there is gaps within the braided layer which gaps (presumably gaps between fibers of the braid) are eliminated by the secxond fluorocarbon dispersion applied to the braid layer. Such is not originally disclosed and as such there is a question of new matter raised by the proposed amendment which does not simplify the issues on appea Additionally, the proposed new language relating to the gaps being filled and the presence of the gaps raises new issues which would require further search and/or consideration.